pre

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/574,398	05/19/2000	Ruslan Belkin	15437-0113	7210

29989 7590 12/04/2003

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
1600 WILLOW STREET
SAN JOSE, CA 95125

EXAMINER	
HALIM, SAHERA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2157	14

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRG

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/574,398	Applicant(s) BELKIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Sahera Halim	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 September 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *6 - 9, 15 - 18, 24 - 36* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *6 - 9, 15 - 18, 24 - 36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communication filled on September 11, 2003.

2. Claims 1 - 5, 10 - 14, and 19 – 23, have been cancelled.

3. Claims 6, 7, 9, 15, 16, 18, 24, 25 and 27 have been amended.

4. Claims 28 – 36 have been added.

5. Claims 24 – 36 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 6, 15, and 24, recite the limitation "said memory-mapped file" in the claims. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For examination purposes, it is assumed as "a memory-mapped file".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 6, 15 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courts et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,076,108 (hereinafter Courts) in view of Hickman et al U.S. Pat. No. 6,564,252 (hereinafter Hickman).

10. Regarding claim 6, Courts discloses a computer system, comprising (abstract):

a shared storage (abstract; global session server (212));

a first server process, said first server process servicing a first request pertaining to a particular session, said first server process storing session information pertaining to said particular session in said shared storage; and a second server process, said second server process servicing a second request pertaining to said particular session, said second server process accessing said session information from said shared storage and using said session information to service said second request (abstract, Courts et al. discloses receiving a request from a user that initiates a user session with the web system and processing the request to provide a web page to the user. Session data (220) representing a state of the user session is stored in memory in a global session server (212). Then, for each subsequent request associated with the user session, the subsequent request is received, and the session data (220) is retrieved from the global session server (212). The subsequent request is then processed using the session data (220) to provide a web page to the user, and the session data (220) is changed to reflect the processing. The session data (220) is then updated in the global session server (212). The global session (212) thereby stores session data (220)...).

Courts does not disclose wherein each of the said first and second server processes has a memory space associated therewith, and wherein a memory-mapped file is mapped to at least a portion of the memory space associated with said first server process and at least a portion of the memory space associated with said second server process.

However, Hickman discloses wherein each of the said first and second server processes has a memory space associated therewith, and wherein a memory-mapped file is mapped to at least a portion of the memory space associated with said first server process and at least a portion of the memory space associated with said second server process (Fig. 3 and col. 5, line 44 – col. 6, line 27). It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Courts and Hickman to increase reliability and scaling of the system and to eliminate time consuming path lookups (col. 1 line 63 – col. 2, line 24).

11. Claims 15 and 24 have similar limitations to claim 1, therefore, they are rejected under the same rational.

12. Regarding claims 9,18, and 27, Courts discloses said second server process sets a busy indicator associated with said session information to indicate that said session information is currently in use, thereby preventing any other server process from using said session information while said second server process is using said session information (col. 7, line 59 – col. 8, line 54 and col. 9, line 30 – 52; Courts discloses

locking the session data to indicate that session information is currently in use and to prevent concurrent access).

13. Reference to claim 28, 31, and 34, Courts teaches the system of claim 1, wherein said second server process updates said session information to derive a set of updated session information, and wherein said second server process stores said updated session information in said shared storage (abstract, Courts et al. discloses session data (220) representing a state of the user session is stored in memory in a global session server (212). Then, for each subsequent request associated with the user session, the subsequent request is received, and the session data (220) is retrieved from the global session server (212). The subsequent request is then processed using the session data (220) to provide a web page to the user, and the session data (220) is changed to reflect the processing. The session data (220) is then updated in the global session server (212). The global session (212) thereby stores session data (220)...).

14. Claims 29, 30, 32, 33, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courts in view Hickman and further in view of Bellemore et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,088,728 (hereinafter Bellemore).

15. Regarding claims 29, 32 and 35 Courts and Hickman do not disclose updated session information replaces said session information in said shared storage. However, this limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Bellemore. Bellemore discloses

updated session information replaces said session information in said shared storage (col. 9 line 9 – 20). It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at time of the invention to modify Courts by Bellemore in order to save memory space and increase processing time.

16. Regarding claims 30, 33, and 36, Courts discloses a third server process, said third server process servicing a third request pertaining to said particular session, said third server process accessing said updated session information from said shared storage and using said updated session information to service said third request (abstract, Courts et al. discloses receiving a request from a user that initiates a user session with the web system and processing the request to provide a web page to the user. Session data (220) representing a state of the user session is stored in memory in a global session server (212). Then, for each subsequent request associated with the user session, the subsequent request is received, and the session data (220) is retrieved from the global session server (212). The subsequent request is then processed using the session data (220) to provide a web page to the user, and the session data (220) is changed to reflect the processing. The session data (220) is then updated in the global session server (212). The global session (212) thereby stores session data (220)...)

17. Claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Courts in view Hickman and further in view of Bayeh et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,098,093 (hereinafter Bayeh).

18. Regarding claim 7, 16 and 25, Courts and Hickman fail to teach said first server process stores said session information into said shared storage in the form of a serialized byte stream. Nonetheless Bayeh discloses that this limitation is well known in the art. Bayeh discloses server process stores said session information into said shared storage in the form of a serialized byte stream (col. 4, line 40 – 50). It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to store session information in the form of a serialized byte stream in order to prevent collision of retrieval requests with the update requests and thereby preventing the return of invalid or corrupted session state information to the requesting processes.

19. Regarding claims 8, 17, and 26, Courts and Hickman do not teach said second server process de-serializes said serialized byte stream prior to using said session information to service said second request. Bayeh discloses session information is stored in the form of in a serialized form (col. 4, line 40 – 50). Bayeh does not explicitly disclose the de-serialization of data prior to using the information to service a second request. However, de-serializing is the opposite of serializing and before storing the information to the storage in serialize form, the information is in de-serialize form to be utilized for addressing a request. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to de-realize session state information in order to use the information to service the second request.

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6,15, and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sahera Halim whose telephone number is (703) 305-8054. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Sahera Halim
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2157

November 21, 2003

ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100